

This is an excellent piece of work and in what follows I seek rather to carry the discussion further than to offer any particular criticisms, although it will be clear that I do not entirely agree with all that the author says. Nevertheless from the outset it should be said that he argues his position clearly and well, the work is well structured and in general sources are used accurately and the reading is clearly very wide.

The part on liberation theology in the second chapter is not entirely satisfactory. Either the student or Cavanaugh (or perhaps both) have a rather limited view of liberation theology and fail to understand its use of Marxist terminology. By the time Cavanaugh wrote his work, there was certainly ample literature available from Gutierrez and others to demonstrate far more clearly the nature of Marxism in liberation theology. It is also rather odd to see Moltmann called a liberation theologian.

I would have preferred a slight more critical presentation of radical orthodoxy, which is based on a misreading of so many sources that its central premise, however superficially appealing, must be called into question. I don't think the student particularly agrees with radical orthodoxy, but at times it would have been good to have had a clearer direct critique of it.

I'm not sure about the reading of Cavanaugh in section 3.3, and how fair it is to see him as so critical of the Chilean Church under Pinochet. I think he rather realises that there were different phases. In terms of the role of the state, surely it would be better to read the situation in Chile as one where the Church still had considerable influence. Chile was not a modern European state, at least in terms of Church-State separation. Even if there was official separation in the constitution, it was certainly *de facto* in a very strong position. Part of the initial problem was that the Church feared that, under Allende, it was losing its power, (although already in 1950 Alberto Hurtado had asked if Chile was still a Catholic country) and so it supported or at least tolerated Pinochet as a safeguard of its traditional role at the centre of national life. It was the damage to the "body" which then led it to oppose the dictatorship and protect the wounded body. In this sense, it may be unfair to criticise Cavanaugh for not applying his findings from Chile to the rest of the world, or at least to other states where there is no torture.

One question which arises from the discussion on Cavanaugh's rejection of the state is what he understands by "anarchy". As he is a Roman Catholic, it is very hard to see how Roman Catholicism can be equated with anarchy, and indeed how the eucharist can be "an-archival". Indeed, there is an evident contradiction between emphasising the physicality of the body of Christ in its different aspects and the idea of anarchy. The *arche* is clearly incarnated. I realise that the author of this dissertation is not supporting Cavanaugh here, but this critique could be expanded by acknowledging this point. On the other hand, to talk about Cavanaugh investing the eucharist with almost magical qualities (cf. pp.35-36, "Mnohem závažnější je fakt, že Cavanaughův důraz na zázračnou moc eucharistie místy vyvolává dojem až magické schopnosti eucharistie nikoliv pouze vytvořit alternativní model společenství mezi věřícími, ale zejména alternativní oblast politickou") is rather problematic from many aspects. I know this is a common accusation from various streams of Protestantism, but it needs to be argued and demonstrated, and I don't think this is the case with Cavanaugh. In general, the title is not explained or much developed, which is a shame, since it would be interesting to see what this idea of "Eucharistic anarchy" really means.

The concept of the "eucharistization of the world" is also rather problematic, since it apparently replaces one form of reductionism (the absolute primacy of the state) with another. *Sacramentum Concilium* defines the eucharist as the source and summit of Christian life, but

this definition seems to place it also as the medium and content of Christian life as well. However, if all is Eucharist, what really is the eucharist, and how can it have any transformative or prophetic or any other kind of specific role?

I'm wondering about the claim that Cavanaugh implicitly reduces religion to another form of ideology (p.47). Given the claim earlier on in the work that radical orthodoxy can be seen as a form of Barthian theology (a claim which I am not sure is entirely correct), this would of course be a necessary or at least probable consequence of Cavanaugh's position. Indeed, the idea that religions are ideological seems to me not unreasonable.

As to the arguments about the development of the modern state, I suppose part of the problem is that Cavanaugh is writing out of two predominant contexts, the American and the Latin American, or more specifically Chilean. I'm not sure whether liberalism is the absolutely best word for describing either, but in its rigid separation of church and state the American Constitution is undoubtedly following or creating a liberal tradition, and most of the Latin American countries, achieving their independence in the first quarter or so of the nineteenth century were in turn influenced by the US. Perhaps one of the problems is to assume that there is only one paradigm of the modern state.

In terms of the critique of Cavanaugh that he ultimately requires that Christians abstain from engagement in politics, it may be interesting to consider John Howard Yoder. Yoder would also argue for a witness against the state in as far as it is opposed to Christian values but, at least in my reading of him, in the end he wants Christians to be outside of the system. However, I think it would also be fair to both him and Cavanaugh to note that this does not equate to quietism. In essence, this is what one might call a Trotskyite position – you cannot do deals with the devil, so only complete transformation and “revolution” will suffice. Of course, whether this is in any sense realistic is another question, and given that it probably isn't, one might legitimately ask if this distancing from the state doesn't end up being a form of complicity with it.

I wonder whether it is entirely fair to criticise Cavanaugh for not having a sense of the “dangerous memory”. One could easily construct an argument that would say that the “Eucharistic anarchy” of which he speaks is one way of talking about this memory, for it is in the eucharist that the apparent power of the State is challenged by the anamnestic memory of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, presenting the power of the broken body to triumph over death. It seems to me that this is one of the things that Cavanaugh would be arguing for.

In response to Volf's claim that Jesus came to save sinners, which includes the oppressors, one might do well to recall Jon Sobrino's reflections on this question. He points out that Jesus has a very different attitude to the Pharisees, and others he regards as oppressors, than he does to those called “tax-collectors and sinners”. In other words, there are those who sin because of the circumstances they find themselves in and there are those who create or maintain those circumstances, and Jesus does not adopt the same position to the two groups. I think this is basically the line Sobrino and Cavanaugh would follow, and in this sense they would disagree with Volf.

In conclusion, I repeat once again that this is a really excellent work, way beyond what one might expect for Bachelor's level, and the student is to be congratulated for an interesting and thoughtful engagement with very important issues, which have relevance also for the Czech situation. I give it as a mark 1.

Tim Noble, v Praze, 3.9.10